

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-44, which stand rejected in the above-identified application. By the foregoing amendment, Applicant has amended paragraphs [0009] and [0047] of the specification. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as originally filed. No new matter is added by the amendments. In view of the following discussion, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Specification objections:

Applicant respectfully acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for addressing the informalities with the disclosure. Applicant herein submits amendments to the specification to correct the subject informalities. As such, Applicant has amended paragraph [0009], line 3, to replace “is” with “are”. Applicant has amended paragraph [0047], line 15, to replace “lesson” with “lessen”. However, with regard to paragraph [0010], line 5, Applicant submits that the word “employ” is correct as used because gateways is plural. Indeed, paragraph [0010], line 5, recites “the gateways in the system employ....”. If the verb was applied to “the system”, then “employs” would be appropriate. However, “the system” is in the prepositional phrase describing “the gateways”. As such, Applicant submits that the amendments cure the informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner’s objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under §102(e) and §103(a)

In the Office Action at page 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 11-17, 19-26, 31-37, and 39-44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0105508 to Saha (hereinafter “Saha”). In the Office Action at page 20, the Examiner rejected claims 7-10, 18, 27-30, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0107991 to Tezuka et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that conception of the instant application occurred at least prior to November 14, 2003. Reduction to practice is not necessary to predate a prior art reference. *See Pfäff v. Wells Electronics, Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 60-61 (1998). As such, Applicant submits and includes herewith a Declaration under 37 CFR §1.131 of named inventor James Karanassos

swearing behind the Saha reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's §102(e) and §103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above remarks and amendments. The fee for the petition is included herewith. In the event there are any fees due and owing in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Dated: January 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/Jeffrey I. Kaplan/
Jeffrey I. Kaplan, Reg. No. 34,356
KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER L.L.P.
900 Route 9 North, Suite 104
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095
(732) 634-7634
Attorneys for Applicant